

The Carroll Free Press.

"THE UNION OF THE STATES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNION."

VOLUME 25,---NUMBER 31.

CARROLLTON, CARROLL COUNTY, OHIO, THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1857.

WHOLE NUMBER, 1,379.

Miscellaneous Reading.

THE PLUNDERING OF THE TREASURY —FACTS FROM THE RECORDS.

The late developments relative to the management of the Treasury of this State, are but a faint shadow to the series of frauds and plunderings which have disgraced the administration of the Locofoco party in Ohio. They show that corruption is not confined to one or two departments, but that it extended to almost every branch of the State service. Let us for a moment refer to facts which have become a part of our history.

For a series of years prior to 1856, the Locofoco party had entire control of all branches of the State government. Under the biennial system there was no session of the Legislature in the winter of 1854-5. During the year 1855 the officers of State should have conducted the affairs of government with the appropriations of the previous year. But, with a presentment that this was their last grab at the Treasury, these men squandered the people's money to an unprecedented amount. By reference to the official reports the following facts are made manifest:

The total amount of expenditures of 1854-5 beyond the appropriations, and which were of course totally unauthorized, was \$617,373. It was in substance and reality a debt of that amount contracted by the Locofoco officials, and was thrown upon the Republicans to pay. Our opponents had spent the money, squandered it, stole it, used it up in various ways, and we were left the privilege of coming in and footing their bills. The details of this expenditure are given in the message of Gov. Chase, January 5th, 1857, and in the report of the Auditor of State, and are as follows:

Disbursements of 1856, to pay debts incurred prior to Nov. 15, 1855.

Superintendence and repairs of canals.	\$138,090 18
New State House.	249,768 71
Deaf and Dumb Asylum.	3,488 00
Blind Asylum.	2,300 00
Columbus Lunatic Asylum.	24,025 41
Dayton Lunatic Asylum.	47,515 88
Newburgh Lunatic Asylum.	48,434 47
Payments for Swan's Revised Statutes.	3,750 00

Total paid last year. \$517,373 55

In addition, the Auditor of State reports that there are from \$100,000 to \$120,000 of debts yet unpaid. Of this sum, \$60,000 are claims for work upon the State House.

Such are the sums squandered by our opponents beyond the amounts appropriated by the last Locofoco Legislature. It was a legacy bequeathed to the new party, not in the shape of cash to expend, but of debts to pay. Be it remembered, these do not include the transactions of Breslin with broken and shavers, by which he admitted a loan to the State of over \$200,000, nor of the Board of Public Works in disposing of the contracts for repairs. It is distinct from the \$730,000 which Breslin drew from County Treasurers just before he went out of office. And, how was this debt of \$617,373 created? Where did the money go? Did the State ever get a fair consideration for it? or was it squandered on political favorites? Let us look into this.

The Joint Investigating Committee on State buildings, &c., made an elaborate examination into all the details, and in their report to the Legislature and the people, (page 376) they sum up the useless expenditures, frauds and over charges as follows:

Ohio Penitentiary.	\$5,183 63
Over on Books.	5,559 55
Over charge on Physician.	800 00
Paid Wm. Trevitt.	198 00
Fraud on Corn Contract.	505 00

\$12,251 38

New State House.	\$106,000 00
Useless expenditures.	43,229 44

\$149,229 44

Newburgh Lunatic Asylum.	\$5,500 00
Useless expenditures.	51,642 90

\$57,142 90

Dayton Lunatic Asylum.	\$5,500 00
Useless expenditures.	55,260 05

\$60,760 05

Grand total.	\$279,383 77
--------------	--------------

This sum of over a quarter of a million of dollars, does not include the stealings, &c., in the item of \$138,090 18, the excess on the canals—Those desirous of tracing some of the beauties of those operations, are referred to the report of the Joint Investigating Committee on Public Works.

This view will convey to the mind of the intelligent reader an idea of the condition of our State affairs, after six years' management by the Locofoco party. The Republicans found the finances of the State in a wretched condition. They found considerably over half a million of dollars of debts for which they were compelled to provide, in addition to the ordinary current expenses of the Government. They found the Treasury minus over \$200,000.00 by the confession of Breslin who

he retired, and subsequent developments have shown that he took from the County Treasurers in the last hours of his term, about \$550,000 more than he has ever accounted for to the people of the State.

We present this record to the people of Ohio for their consideration. With all these difficulties and debts thrown upon us by the men who had squandered the money, the affairs of the State have been well managed, and every interest carefully guarded. The total amount of taxes levied last year, as shown by the report of the Auditor of State, was \$944,997 97 less than that of the year previous, and the taxes of this season will be less than they last year. The actual expenditures for 1856 were \$380,665 71 less than that of the 1855, which was the last year of Locofoco rule; although there was no Legislature in that year, whereas there was a session with all its attendant expenses in 1855.

We call upon our friends in every section of the State to lay these facts before the voters and tax-payers of Ohio. It is essential that they should know them. The idea of calling back again to places of power and trust, a set of men who have so miserably mismanaged the business and plundered the Treasury of the State, will not for a moment be tolerated by the honest and industrious masses, when they see and know the truth.—O. S. Journal.

TERRIBLE TRAGEDY IN CINCINNATI— A CITIZEN MURDERED IN COLD BLOOD AND THE WIFE STRANGLED.

At an early hour yesterday morning, says the Cincinnati Gazette of yesterday, the city was startled by the announcement that N. T. Horton, an old, well known and influential citizen, of the firm of N. T. Horton & Co., manufacturers of enamelled grates and marbleized iron, had been brutally murdered at his private residence, on Ohio avenue, Vine Street Hill, in the suburbs of the city.

The baleful news spread and by 9 o'clock hundreds of our citizens were anxiously questioning each other, and marvelling, if the account of the bloody tragedy, as popularly given, could be true. A number of them soon repaired to the house of Mr. Horton, and there beheld a scene well calculated to freeze their blood, and heard a sanguinary tale they were at first ill prepared to believe.

Augmentation of Horrors—the whole Story.

Mr. Horton had been awakened a little after 4 o'clock by a heavy smoke pouring into his chamber, and supposing the house to be on fire he rose and opened the door and started to go into the hall, where he was encountered by a German serving-man, for some time in his employ, named Joseph Laefner, who struck him in the abdomen with a butcher-knife, causing a deep and ghastly wound that proved fatal a few minutes after, and then ran out of the house.

Mr. Horton's mother-in-law, Mrs. Mary Ann Smith, also awakened by the smoke, came into the hall and beheld Mr. H. bleeding profusely, and heard him exclaim, "Mother, I am stabbed." Mrs. S., terribly alarmed, ran to the window and cried "murder and fire," and Mr. H. fell in a dying state to the floor.

The neighbors soon rushed into the house, and found Mr. H. not quite dead, and the family bordering on a state of phrenzy. They removed Mr. H., who had no garment upon his person besides his shirt, to the yard, and placing him upon the grass, covered him up with a blanket. They then looked about for the guilty party, and soon perceived Joseph Laefner, near the green house, on the premises, whom they pursued, when he lay down. They came up to him and found him bleeding profusely from both his wrists and from a deep gash in his throat. They asked him if he had murdered Horton, and if he had wounded himself, and he expressed assent, but could not speak.

It was learned a short time after, in a manner that will be understood from the depositions below that previous to murdering Mr. Horton, he had strangled his own wife, residing at No. 623 Vine street, and then set fire to Mr. H.'s house, with the expectation of wreaking vengeance upon its proprietor for an imagined wrong. Having accomplished his fell purpose, he had endeavored to destroy himself by opening the principal veins near his wrist, and cutting his throat with a razor.

The Alleged cause of the Murder.

Laefner and his wife had both been employed as domestics in the house of Mr. Horton; the former for nearly two and the latter for three or four years. They often quarreled, and Laefner was in the habit of abusing her, which rendered him disagreeable to the family of Mr. H., who reprimanded him for his conduct. Laefner had married his wife, formerly Francisca Kehler, about nine months before. Francisca had not recently lived in Mr. H.'s family, but had been there since the confinement of Mrs. H., in the beginning of last week. The husband had abused her on Monday, and appeared more than usually malignant. Many have supposed that the German had contracted a hatred for Mr. H. because of the censures of that gentleman. But it seems the chief cause of that insane wrath which impelled Laefner to slay his wife and his employer was jealousy. He has by signs confessed this since the tragedy. He, no doubt, though without reason, as far as we can learn suspected his wife of an improper intimacy with Horton.

Mrs. Laefner was much liked by Mr. Horton's

family, and kindly treated, because a faithful and estimable domestic. This conduct on their part may have been, and probably was, strangely misconstrued by Laefner.

The murder of Francisca Laefner.

The manner of the murder of Mrs. Laefner by her husband is wrapped in mystery, although it appears she was either strangled or smothered.—No one knew of the fatal act until the door of the room occupied by Mrs. L. was forced, and her body half nude, and her face discolored and livid, was discovered upon her bed. What the unfortunate woman suffered on that fearful night from her demon husband, no one can tell; but the loneliness of the hour, her inability to obtain aid, the terror she must have endured, the horrid manner of her death and the mystery that surrounds it, call up a picture no tragedy upon the stage could surpass. The imagination needs not to be exercised here; give only the circumstances to a thinking mind, and that room glows with a horror such as Mrs. Radcliffe, Lewis and Poe would have fed daintily upon, and furnished in the most epicurean terrors to minds as morbid as their own. This strangling of his wife by Laefner in the dreary night, and in so mysterious a manner, is, to our mind, one of the most tragic features of this most tragic tragedy.

THE BUNKER HILL CEREMONY.

Among the host of spectators at the late interesting ceremony at Bunker Hill was Mr. Willis, who has furnished to his paper—the Home Journal—some glowing descriptions of the impressive scene. As was natural, his swelling emotions found expression in his most felicitous manner, as the annexed excerpts from his second letter will exemplify:

"My last letter told you of Mr. Everett's eloquence on the seventeenth; and you will easily conceive that it was like a sea-bird's toss upon the waves after a storm, 'with the swell on,' to sit and realize the spot and its associations after such stirring of patriotic memories. The military band followed after with a solemn march while the statue was unveiled, the heroic marble telling its own story to the multitude as the superb canopy of flags was slowly drawn aside. And I remember to have seen nothing in my life more dramatically effective. It warms a statue wonderfully in expression to have ten thousand eager admirers gazing at it with the same feeling at the instant; and I must own to a thrill of emotion very strange under that multitudinous magnetism. I tried to say something to the friend at my side, but could not; for there is a gate somewhere between heart and brain that proves too small somehow for the passing of a thought ten thousand strong! Why should these best throbs of our whole existence so choke off the most emotional gift—human utterance? Tell us, oh, Agassiz!

"While thus powerfully impressed, by eloquent speech and eloquent marble, with a representation of the men we have had, it was both apt and gratifying to see, upon the stage before us, in the eloquence of life and reality, a representation of the men we have got. Fifty of the most distinguished gentlemen of our country occupied the seats of honor upon the platform, and I studied their physiognomies with very great interest.

"For fine studies, artistically speaking, the sculptor would have chosen two heads nearer to the speaker—Mr. Mason's, of Virginia, and Mr. George Peabody's—both men of large stature and full person, but alike remarkable also for that massive robustness of feature that 'cuts well in marble.' On opposite sides again, and next to those gentle men, were two younger men, whom it was impossible not to classify as you saw them within reach of each other, a pair of intellectually model heads of indomitable firmness—Governor Gardner and Speaker Banks. Then there was the embodiment of the Pilgrim ideal in the apostolic and scholarly features of the President of Harvard; and there was the large-hearted humility of a Howard in the marked lineaments and self-forgetful air of the magnificent Cooper; and there was Robert Winthrop, with his inheritance of the air gubernatorial; and healthy Burlingame, the well-woven triplicate of fun, fluency and fire; and Col. Aspinwall, the Wellington looking veteran who was chief marshal of the day; and the straightforward and prompt President of the Bunker Hill Association, Mayor Warren, who, as the descendant of the hero in marble, was the occasion's proper spokesman and host.

"Upon these, and the forty or fifty other eminent men upon the raised platform, I looked with the natural interest of comparison, as the orator called up for us once more the shadows of the heroes of '76, and in the vivid array of the two periods I could feel no disparagement of our time. With cause for another revolution there would be plenty of mind for it, as well as plenty of strong will, courage and patriotism, no spectator of that scene could have a doubt.

"Of the day's main procession of events the newspapers have given faithful account; but there were two incidental features of very dramatic interest to me—two instances of personal look, manner and bearing—which the reporters have alluded to very slightly. Both were unforeseen in the programme—the appearance of a young lady Senator upon the platform; and of a young lady of seventeen among the audience below; the latter a lineal descendant of the hero whose statue was to be inaugurated; and of these let me say a word in passing:

"Mr. Mason's fine head had interested me as he sat upon the stage, though I had failed to discover who he was by inquiries of those around me. When Mr. Winthrop, with his usual parliamentary felicity, introduced him at last as the worthy

known Senator from Virginia, my curiosity was naturally increased—his position, before that audience of seven thousand, (very nearly at an odds, political and sectional, of one to six thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine,) being one of rather formidable embarrassment. He arose and stepped forward to the table, and I in vain scrutinized his features, setting very near to him as I did, for any trace either of composure or defiance. His calm eye made the circuit of the pavilion, while he collected his thoughts for reply to a summons wholly unexpected.

"Of his speech, in giving the substance, the reports make an imperfect representation. The fluency, the deliberateness of accent, the dignity and well balanced measures of epithet and rhythm—admirable under any circumstances in an extemporaneous speech—were here even curious in their perfection. But it was in the air and bearing of the man that his conscious quality of soul, his instinctive will, character, and purpose were most eloquently expressed. Of intellectual repose, and of the calm courtesy of mindless kept habitually in training, his whole presence was the type undeniable. Dignity so absolutely faultless, both of mien and tone—fine as it would be with the most elaborate study and preparation—was, in this critical impromptu of the Virginian Senator, very remarkable.

"And of the young lady of seventeen, who sat within a few feet of Mr. Mason, (if I may be permitted to say so of apparently the same stock and breeding,) let me venture to record also my impression.

"By accidental detention of her father, a grandson of Gen. Warren, Miss Newcomb, whose residence was in the interior of the State, had arrived late in Boston, accompanied only by a youthful brother, to attend the presentation of the statue. The Committee of Arrangements, hearing, at the last moment, of her presence, called upon the lady well known as the Queen of Boston hospitality to strangers, requesting her to act as chaperon to the interesting guest, as she could not be included regularly in the procession. Promptly acceded to by Mrs. Otis, the duties of convoy and introduction were most cordially and kindly performed; nearly every person of distinction, during the day's ceremonies or the evening festivities at the Mayor's, being formally presented to her. Tall for her age, and of very fine form and very marked superiority of expression and personal bearing, she played her conspicuous part in that celebration, as her heroic ancestor, could have looked out of his eyes of marble, would have been proud to see. She was but a school-girl, remember, yet, by the great number and great variety of strangers who in turn addressed her, she was in no way disconcerted. Her replies, her smiles, a tact of well bred ease which a Princess Royal might have taken for a model. It is evidently superior blood in good perpetuation thus far; and to see Miss Newcomb playing her part in this scene could strengthen the conviction of the day, that America is not yet upon the wane."

The grandson of Gen. Warren alluded to by Mr. Willis as unable to be present at the ceremony is a resident of Washington, where he has for some years filled a small but respectable office.—Nat. Intelligencer.

The equality of the negro as contended for by the present Fusion party, will, if carried out, amalgamate the races and make this a government of Minks and Monkeys. Its legitimate faults are well illustrated by a case in point, which we take from the Chicago Times—Plaindealer.

One of the legitimate fruits of the Democratic Party is illustrated in tens of thousands of cases in the South in the shape of one-half of the male population, who are the offsprings of the lust of their masters and their masters' sons. Hundreds and thousands of instances are known of masters selling their children into slavery. Such Democratic politicians as the late Senator Butler of South Carolina, and Richard M. Johnson, formerly Democratic Vice President, have had children by their own women slaves. Rev. Dr. Ross is another instance of the amalgamation of the white and black race as carried on at the South. In the Democratic State of South Carolina the fact of a white man's having a harem of negro women and mulatto children, is not considered a bar to his admission to good society, or what they call good society down there. These are stubborn facts, but locofoco politicians have a happy faculty of blinding their followers in regard to the truth of the matter.

To prevent such a system of amalgamation, illicit amalgamation, from spreading, is one of the reasons of the Republican party for opposing the admission of slavery into the territory now free.—Should Democratic policy prevail, that vast and beautiful country in the West would become a second edition of Utah, as far as morals are concerned, with this difference, that the Southern system compels the hapless female slave to submit without form of marriage, while that of Utah has a certain form of marriage which its votaries go through.—Clev. Leader.

"Tommy, my son, what are you going to do with that club?"

"Send it to the editor, of course."

"But what are you going to send it to the editor for?"

"Cause he says, if anybody will send him a club, he will send them a copy of his paper."

The mother came pretty near fainting, but remained conscious enough to ask;

"But Tommy dear, what do you suppose he wants of a club?"

"Well, I don't know replied the hopeful son, unless it is to knock down subscribers as chin, unless it is to pay for their paper!"

Woman is like ivy—the more you are ruined the closer she clings to you. A vile old bachelor adds: "Ivy is like woman—the closer it clings to you the more you are ruined. Knock down the bachelor."

JUDGE LEVITT'S OPINION.

It is not our purpose to comment at large on Judge Levitt's opinion. But it may be of service to point out the defects of that opinion, that they may be thoroughly examined by the younger members of the Bar.

1. In the first place, The Judge does not, for he could not, say that the United States Courts can take men from the criminal jurisdiction of the State Courts. He proceeds upon a different ground—that the *habeas corpus* issued by the State authorities was illegal, and therefore the Deputy Marshals had a right to resist it.

2. To arrive at this, he goes back, and investigates all the preliminary proceedings; in other words trying both parties, which we hold, under a simple writ of *habeas corpus* is, at least, stretching jurisdiction.

3. But, thereby to crown the whole, he says the State Courts have no right to issue a writ of *habeas corpus* for a prisoner in custody of a United States officer. This argument, on this point, we report for the sake of reference:

Without a critical notice of these cases, it may be sufficient to remark that the doctrine seems now to be settled that a State Judge has no jurisdiction to issue a writ of *habeas corpus* for a prisoner in custody of an officer of the United States, if the fact of such custody is known to him before issuing the writ. And it is well settled, that if upon the return of the writ it appears that the prisoner is in custody under the authority of the United States, the jurisdiction of the State Judge is at an end, and all other proceedings by him are void.—In the case of Sims, reported in 7th Cushing's Rep. 285, the Supreme Court of Massachusetts decided, that in all cases "before a writ of *habeas corpus* is granted, sufficient probable cause must be shown, but when it appears upon the party's own showing that there is no sufficient ground *prima facie* for his discharge, the Court will not issue the writ; and again the Court says: "It is not granted as a matter of course and the Court will not grant the writ of *habeas corpus*, when they see, that in the result, they must remand the party."

In the case of Norris vs. Newton and others, 5 McLean 92, Judge McLean says, "I have no hesitation in saying that the judicial officers of a State under its own laws, in a case where an unlawful imprisonment is shown by one or more affidavits, may issue a writ of *habeas corpus* and inquire into the cause of detention." The learned Judge, it will be noticed, has reference to an imprisonment under the authority of the United States, and decides as the condition of which a State Judge may issue a writ of *habeas corpus*, that it shall be first shown by affidavits or otherwise, that such imprisonment is unlawful. And he holds, that when it is known to the Judge, that the imprisonment is under a law of the United States, his jurisdiction ceases and all further proceedings in the case will be *coram more judice*.

On this, we remark that there is a mistaken idea at the bottom of this. What does a writ of *habeas corpus* relate to? It does not relate to the conflicting jurisdiction of Courts at all. It relates to the rights demandable of course, and has no relation whatever to the respective jurisdictions of the State and Federal Courts. It is a writ which an imprisoned citizen has a right to demand of any Court, and which no Court, has a right to refuse. That the Government of the United States is paramount, in its legitimate Constitutional functions, is a truism not to be denied. But, is it that the ministerial officers of United States assume to be their functions really so, not to be inquired into? Are citizens of Ohio to be kidnapped, and no inquiry made into the fact by State Courts? We think not, and they who undertake to maintain that doctrine will be likely to find full employment for both their heads and their hands.—Cin. Gazette.

PERSONAL.

TO THE PUBLIC.—The Editor of the Plain Dealer, a scurrilous sheet published in this city by Joseph W. Gray, who claims to speak the sentiments of the Democracy of this city and county, but which is utterly repudiated by the representative portion of the party, (who would not touch it with a pair of tongs, much less receive it into their dwellings,) has seen fit, of late, upon one or two occasions, to assail the undersigned—a private citizen—without the least provocation. The motive, however, is perfectly transparent. As this is the same Joseph W. Gray who was, on one occasion, publicly whipped in the streets of this city, had his nose pulled and his teeth knocked down his throat, and on another occasion had to bawoo spittle squirted into his face, the undersigned, heretofore, has not thought it worth his while to notice anything emanating from such a quarter especially after a jury of his country had, in one of these cases assessed the damages done to his reputation, "in money only," at six cents. But lest the Editor, however, should presume too much upon the immunity which his insignificance has heretofore afforded him, the undersigned takes this occasion to say, that should these unwarrantable assaults be continued, he will seek, in his own way, and in his own time, such redress as the circumstances of the case may require.—Clev. Leader.

An Irishman being told that the price of bread had fallen, exclaimed:—"This is the first time, be jabers, that I ever rejoiced at the fall of my best friend."

From the Richmond Speech, July 19. A FIRE-EATER'S ANECDOTE OF GOV. WALKER.

ONE OF WALKER'S "OPERATIONS."—For our selves, we acknowledge an inability to discriminate between the public and private character of an individual, in so far as to agree that he may be a scoundrel in one capacity and a patriot in the other. That Gov. Walker is not a man of the highest principles of personal honor will sufficiently appear from the following narrative of one among many similar financial exploits:

When Robert J. Walker was a Senator from Mississippi, he ascertained that an old gentleman in Middlesex county in this State, was disposed to sell a large estate in negroes. Accordingly, to company with a colleague in the House of Representatives, Walker made the old gentleman a visit, and after a protracted negotiation succeeded in purchasing the slaves. And he got them on good terms, for the old gentleman—a devoted Democrat—was charmed by the graceful condescension of the distinguished Senator. The aggregate price of the negroes was something more than \$40,000, for which Walker gave a note or draft payable in New Orleans. But the old gentleman would not sell his slaves except on condition that they were to be kept together on a plantation in the South.

Well, the Slaves were taken to New Orleans, were put upon the block and dispersed to the four winds—the purchaser realizing a considerable profit by the "transaction." The note or draft matured, was presented for payment, was protested, and from that day to the present time not a cent has been received either by the old gentleman or his heirs for \$40,000 worth of negroes! Meanwhile Walker has lived in affluence, and is believed now to be a millionaire. Will some one of Walker's apologists impeach the correctness of this story? Let them try it. The substantial truth of the statement shall be verified by testimony which nobody can question.

But this is only an isolated instance. There were many such in Walker's career, of which the history may yet be written. Is that the sort of person to whom the administration should confide a responsible public trust?

LAWRENCE AND THE TOPEKA CONSTITUTION.

A full meeting of the citizens of Lawrence Kansas, was held in the Unitarian Church of that town, on Friday evening, the 15th inst., at which it was unanimously resolved to stand by the Topeka Constitution.

The following persons were elected as delegates to the Topeka Convention:

James Blood, Joel Grover, E. R. Whitman, T. Dwight Thatcher, George H. Crocker, B. W. Woodward, Lyman Allen, George W. Smith, M. F. Conway and S. N. Wood.

The following resolution was then unanimously passed:

Resolved, That our delegates to the Topeka nominating convention, be requested to use their influence and cast their votes for no man for representative to Congress who is not known to be earnestly in favor of the admission of Kansas as a State under the Topeka constitution, by his unswerving fidelity to, and persistent advocacy of a policy so eminently just.

Wm. A. Phillips, of the New York Tribune, addressed the meeting, and stated in the course of his remarks that a fact had come to his knowledge while taking the census, which might serve to show how things were being managed, and where the opposition to the Topeka constitution was being fed. It was a fact of importance, and the people should know it. He had learned, from the gentleman to whom the proposition was made, that a certain editor of a paper in this place (Lawrence) had proposed to another editor to abandon the organization, and go in with his paper and support Gov. Walker, saying that there was to be a Walker party in the territory, and that party was bound to succeed. (Great sensation, and cries of "name him" who is the man, name him, "name him") Mr. Phillips replied, "the man who made the proposition, is G. W. Brown, of the Herald of Freedom; the man to whom it was made is S. S. Prouty, of the Freeman's Champion. (Renewed sensation, and almost universal hissing throughout the assembly.)

A CONJUGAL TRIAL.—At Zurich, in former times, it was the custom, when a married couple applied for a divorce on account of incompatibility of temper, for the magistrate to shut up the pair for a fortnight in an isolated tower on the lake. Not only were they confined to a common room, but they were supplied with only one bed, one chair, one knife and one fork, so that their comfort depended entirely on mutual compliance. If, after the expiration of the fortnight they persisted in their resolution, the tribunal ordered a serious examination of the case, and if possible, the divorce. But in general the quarrelsome pair did not wait for the end of the trial to which they were subjected to become reconciled, and would request to be released.—Galignani's Messenger.

An Irishman once asked the meaning of the word "virgin." He was told that it originally meant a woman who had never been married.—"Be jabers, this mother was a virgin."